



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/603,990

06/26/2003

Mi-Sook Nam

053785-5120

3882

9629 7590 10/30/2007
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

SCHECHTER, ANDREW M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,990

Applicant(s)

NAM ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Schechter

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The submission of the certified translation of the applicant's priority document overcomes the rejection in view of *Jang*, which is no longer considered prior art. These are therefore withdrawn.

The amendment to the claims reciting a substantially flat common electrode overcomes the rejections in view of *Fujimori*. However, the amendment does not make the claims patentable in view of *Kubota* as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota, et al.*, US 2002/0171792 in view of *Maeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325 and further in view of official notice.

Kubota discloses [see Fig. 1, for instance] a transfective liquid crystal display device comprising a substrate [2] having a reflective portion and a transmissive portion,

a gate line [14a] on the substrate, a data line [17], a thin film transistor [14] connected to the gate line and the data line, an insulating layer [19] having an open portion at the transmissive portion, a reflective layer [20] on the insulating layer having a transmissive hole at the open portion, a pixel electrode [3] on the reflective layer, an opposing substrate [5] facing the substrate, and a common electrode [6] on an inner surface of the opposing substrate, the common electrode being substantially flat.

Kubota possibly does not explicitly disclose that the gate and data lines cross to form a pixel region; the examiner takes official notice that this was well-known in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have it so, motivated by the desire to form the standard active matrix of pixels for the display.

Kubota does not disclose that the insulating layer [19] has a plurality of uneven patterns consisting of a first organic material layer within the reflective portion, the uneven patterns partially covering the substrate, and a second organic material layer on the first organic material layer. *Maeda* [see Fig. 10K, for instance] discloses an analogous transfective LCD in which the insulating layer under the reflective layer and pixel electrode has a plurality of uneven patterns consisting of a first organic material layer [51] within the reflective portion, the uneven patterns partially covering the substrate, and a second organic material layer [52] on the first organic material layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have it be so, motivated by the desire to make the surface of the reflective layer bumpy,

so that the light diffusively reflects off the surface (rather than reflecting like a mirror), thus improving the display quality. Claim 1 is therefore unpatentable.

Considering the additional limitations of claim 10, *Kubota* also discloses a liquid crystal layer between the pixel electrode, wherein the pixel electrode and the common electrode are separated by a first cell gap in the transmissive portion, and a second cell gap in the reflective portion, and the first cell gap is twice greater than the second cell gap [see paragraph 0084, for instance]. Claim 10 is therefore unpatentable as well.

Considering the additional limitations of claims 12 and 19, *Kubota* in view of *Maeda* also discloses the method of fabricating the above LCD, except perhaps for the step of performing an exposure and development process on the first and second photosensitive organic material layers. *Maeda* discloses using organic layers which are photosensitive, but does not necessarily disclose the particular patterning steps recited. The examiner takes official notice that for patterning such organic layers, performing an exposure and development process on organic layers was well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do so, motivated by this being the standard technique for patterning organic materials in the art. Claims 12 and 19 are therefore unpatentable as well.

The first and second organic material layers are formed from a photosensitive material, including comprising a photo-acrylic resin [see *Maeda*, col. 13, lines 29-35, for instance], so claims 2 and 3 are also unpatentable. Considering claim 13, it would have been "obvious to try" a photo-acrylic resin for both the first and second photosensitive material layers, with predictable results, as this type of material is routinely used in

forming such organic layers, as evidenced by *Maeda* above, so claim 13 is also unpatentable. The TFT in *Kubota* comprises a gate electrode [14a], an active layer [12], and source and drain electrodes [14b,14c], so claim 7 is also unpatentable.

4. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota, et al.*, US 2002/0171792, *Maeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325, and official notice as applied above, and further in view of *You*, U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508.

Kubota discloses an insulating layer [18] covering the gate line, the data line, and the thin film transistor, but does not state that it is organic. *You* discloses an analogous device [see Fig. 3, for instance], which has an inorganic material layer [116] made of silicon nitride, covering the gate line, the data line, and the thin film transistor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an inorganic layer, such as *You*'s silicon nitride, in the above device, motivated by *You*'s teaching that this maintains the reliability of the transistor and pads and enhances the strength of COG bonding [col. 9, lines 1-8]. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, and 21 are therefore unpatentable.

5. Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kubota, et al.*, US 2002/0171792, *Maeda et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325, and official notice as applied above, in view of official notice.

Kubota does not necessarily disclose gate pads, data pads, or a capacitor electrode overlapping the gate line. The examiner takes official notice that these features are well-known and conventional in the art. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include them in the above device, motivated by the desire to make electrical contact to the gate and data lines, and to provide a reliable storage capacitance to improve the display quality. Claims 8 and 17 are therefore unpatentable.

Similarly, to make electrical contact to these, it is necessary to have drain contact holes, capacitor contact holes, gate pad contact holes, and data pad contact holes as recited; the examiner takes official notice that such are well-known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the purpose of making electrical contact to the relevant electrodes through the second organic material layer. Claims 9 and 18 are therefore unpatentable.

The difference in cell gaps is provided by the height of the insulating film, and for the first (transmissive) cell gap to be twice the second (reflective) cell gap, the height needs to be equal to the second cell gap. The uneven patterns are equal to or less than this height, so they have a height equal to or less than the second cell gap, as required by claims 11 and 20. Claims 11 and 20 are therefore unpatentable. Even were this not true, adjusting the height of the uneven patterns to improve the reflective properties of the reflective layer, or to optimize the relative cell gaps for better liquid crystal behavior, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by the desire to optimize these features of the device, so claims 11 and 20 are unpatentable.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Schechter whose telephone number is (571) 272-2302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/603,990
Art Unit: 2871

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Andrew Schechter
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800
28 October 2007